U.S. Rejects A Castro Olive Branch, P. 3

The Remark by James Baldwin That Attorney General Kennedy Didn't Understand

Dr. Kenneth CLARK [Professor of Psychology, CCNY]: What do you think can be done to change—to use your term—the moral fibre of America?

Mr. James BALDWIN: I think that one has got to find some way of putting the present Administration on the spot. One has got to force somehow, from Washington, a moral commitment, not to the Negro people, but to the life of this country. It doesn't matter any longer and I'm speaking for myself, James Baldwin, and I think I am speaking for a great many other Negroes, too. It doesn't matter any longer what you do to me; you can put me in jail, you can kill me. By the time I was 17, you'd done everything that you can do to me. The problem now is, how are you going to save yourselves? It was a great shock to me—I want to say this on the air—the Attorney General didn't know—

Dr. CLARK: You mean the Attorney General of the U.S.?

Mr. BALDWIN: Mr. Robert Kennedy—that I would have trouble convincing my nephew to go to Cuba, for example, to liberate the Cubans in defense of a government which now says it is doing everything it can do, which cannot liberate me. Now, there are 20,000,000 [Negro] people in this country, and you can't put them all in jail. I know how my nephew feels, I know how I feel, I know how the cats in the barbershop feel. A boy last week, he was sixteen, in San Francisco told me on TV—thank God we got him to talk—maybe somebody thought to listen.. He said, "I got no country. I got no flag." Now, he's only 16 years old, and I couldn't say, 'You do.' I don't have any evidence to prove that he does. They were tearing down his house, because San Francisco is engaging as most cities are engaged in something called urban renewal, which means moving Negroes out. It means Negro removal, that is what it means. The Federal government is an accomplice to this fact. Now, we are talking about human beings. There's no such thing as some abstraction called the Negro problem. These are Negro boys and girls who at 16 and 17 don't believe the country means anything it says and don't believe they have any place here.

—Interview by WGBH-TV, Boston, in New York May 24 immediately following Mr. Baldwin's now celebrated interview with Attorney General Robert Kennedy.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

VOL. XI, NO. 13 JUNE 10, 1963 101 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

We'd Be Better Off Without This Inspection Nonsense

There is good reason to suppose that the latest Kennedy-Macmillan note to Khrushchev on a test ban proposes that the deadlock be broken by a scientific study "to determine," as the Associated Press reported (*Baltimore Sun*, May 31) "whether on-the-spot inspections are needed to detect sneak atomic explosions." It is hard to decide whether this is just a ploy or serious. What makes it seem a ploy is that the Soviet government has several times declined to cooperate in joint efforts on test detection. What makes one wonder whether it is serious is the similar secretiveness of our own government. Is it ready to disclose to the Russians what it is unwilling to tell our own people?

Don't Forget Rusk's Admission

Last March 11, for example, Secretary Rusk told a hearing before Senator Humphrey that our capacity for detecting violations of a nuclear test ban are "better than can be fully disclosed." Senator Humphrey has been trying for months to persuade the Administration to release a classified report showing how efficiently we have been able to monitor Russian earthquakes over the past five years. Is this new offer of a scientific study only another ploy our military-scientific bureaucracy feel sure the Russians will reject?

The truth is that the human race would be better off if the stubborn and secretive great Powers agreed to a test ban without inspection. Even if either side now accepted the other's number of on-site inspections, months could easily be spent in negotiating the "modalities" of inspection—how large an area would be covered, how the inspection teams would be made up, what would happen if either side demanded inspection in a particularly sensitive area on the other side's territory, etc. Even if the shoals of negotiation were navigated and a treaty adopted, the inspection provisions would be a constant source of suspicion and recrimination. The Administration's experience with inspection after the Cuban crisis should be a lesson. Every time Khrushchev belched after dinner, there would be a Keating on the Senate floor waving a security report and asking why we were not digging up the Kremlin walls to determine what was the burp which exploded there at 7:15 p.m. Moscow time the night before. The Russians would not be the only difficult ones. Wait until they demanded the right to dig around near a secret SAC base out west.

(Continued on Page Four)

Before It Is Too Late

W.W. Rostow popularized the idea of a take-off point in economic development. We are—in quite another and sinister sense—nearing a take-off point in race relations. As the wave of Negro demonstrations spreads, there is danger that some unexpected incident—the assassination of a beloved Negro leader, the killing by police of a child demonstrator, or some desperate act by the Negroes themselves—may set off a series of race riots North and South. To guard against so terrible an outburst, to open a channel of communication between the races, to facilitate friendly dialogue between them, to set an example for similar action at the community level, we urge a White House conference as soon as possible of white and Negro leaders to form a national inter-racial committee. No new civil rights bill could have the healing effect of moral leadership thus brought to bear at the highest level.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Good Point From Which to Launch A Renewed Attack on HUAC

JFK Gives Witch Hunters Power to Look at Everybody's Tax Returns

The most nauseating political event of the fortnight was President Kennedy's action in signing an order allowing the House Un-American Activities Committee, in this Congress as in the last, to violate the privacy of income and other tax returns. This new order gives the Committee authority to engage in a large scale fishing operation in Federal tax records from 1947 to 1963. "Any information obtained by the Committee is confidential," the AP explained, "although facts pertinent to an investigation may be reported to the House." That's about as confidential as a sewing circle secret. Like his vote to override Truman's veto of the Internal Security Act in 1950 and his silence during the fight against McCarthyism, this again shows how little commitment Kennedy has to First Amendment rights. Is there no way to challenge this invasion of privacy in the courts? If some Congressman introduced a bill to deny indiscriminate and wholesale access to tax records by *any* committee, it would be a useful way to carry on the fight against the un-Americans. . . . Or, alternatively, a Congressman might demand that if this authority can be used to look for financial backers of liberal and Left organizations, it ought also to be used to uncover the secret financial backers —and the earnings—of the Birch Society and other crypto-Fascist groups. . . . Especially now, in the wake of Chairman Walter's death, would be a good time, and this order a good occasion for a counter-attack. . . .

Blank Check Subpoenas

Although Mr. Walter was a champion of strict procedure in administrative cases involving property rights, he allowed his HUAC staff to indulge in the loosest kind of practices. A sample was involved in a case decided by the Supreme Court last Monday (*Dawson v. Wheeler*). William Wheeler, an investigator for the Committee in Southern California, obtained a number of blank subpoenas signed by Walter, and then proceeded to fill the names in as he pleased. The Solicitor General himself conceded on appeal that no such power had been delegated to Wheeler.

One of those whose names had been filled in, a certain Admiral Dawson, was never even called by the Committee to testify. But Wheeler, by serving this unauthorized subpoena on Dawson at the latter's place of employment, caused his discharge. Dawson sued Wheeler for damages and lost in the lower courts. One of the questions before the Supreme Court was whether a Committee investigator under such circumstances was liable for injury caused by illegal and malicious issuance of subpoenas. Justice Douglas for the majority held that the Federal Tort Claims Act does not reach that far but Justice Brennan with the Chief Justice and Black protested that the case should have been remanded to the trial court to see whether such a suit might not be entertained under Federal common law.

For the second time in three years the Supreme Court last Monday refused to hear an appeal from the FCC's practice since 1958 of requiring applicants for licenses to answer a non-Communist questionnaire. Judge Washington in the Court of Appeals protested in an earlier case that this was based on no legislative authorization. The practice was a McCarthy era innovation. No political tests were imposed by the FCC in its first 24 years of existence. Black, Douglas and Brennan thought the appeal should have been heard.

Good Question

Dear Mr. Stone:

I have been an avid, almost incorrigible reader of your newsletter for the past several years, considering you one of the most objective reporters around (probably because I generally agree with you). I would like to ask you one question, however, which I'd appreciate your answering if convenient—that is, why do you portray President Kennedy as a man that would like to implement a good liberal policy on all fronts but hasn't got the guts to do it? I have seen no indication in his entire career that he has any real liberal sentiments at all, on anything. He seems to be no more of a liberal than Governor Rockefeller. Is it true that he is a well-intentioned weak man? Or is he a non-intentioned non-entity?"

Robert Hurwitt,
Scarsdale, N. Y.

I wish I knew.—IFS

Majority of Supreme Court Now Ready to Outlaw Electronic Eavesdropping

While the Supreme Court 6-to-3 on May 28 upheld the use of a concealed recorder to take down a bribe offer to a Federal tax agent, the lineup shows that there is now a majority on the Court against electronic eavesdropping. The majority speaking through Mr. Justice Harlan, insisted that this case (Lopez v. U.S.) did not involve eavesdropping at all in the proper sense. "The government," the majority said, "did not use the electronic device to listen in on conversations it could not otherwise have heard. Instead the device was used only to obtain the most reliable evidence possible of a conversation in which the Government's own agent was a participant and which that agent was fully entitled to disclose."

On that basis Mr. Justice Black went with the majority. Some years ago Black dissented strongly when the Court (in On Lee v. U.S.) refused to hold that Fourth amendment guarantees were violated when an electronic device was used to enable a Federal agent to listen in from outside a Chinese laundry on a conversation between a narcotics suspect and an informer specially wired for this eavesdropping operation. Brennan, Douglas and Goldberg, dissenting in this new case, argued that On Lee should be reversed. The Chief Justice, though with the majority in Lopez, agreed with the dissenters that the Fourth amednment should cover electronic eavesdropping. With Black, this makes five members ready to reverse On Lee v. U.S. when an appropriate case arises.

"Electronic surveillance," Brennan said for the dissenters in the tax bribe case "destroys all anonymity and all privacy; it makes government privy to everything that goes on. In the light of these circumstances I think it is an intolerable anomaly that while conventional searches and seizures are regulated by the Fourth and 14th Amendments and wiretapping is prohibited by Federal statute, electronic surveillance as involved in the instant case, which poses the greatest danger to the right of private freedom, is wholly beyond the pale of Federal law." It looks as if it won't be much longer.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A. L. Strong From Peking Reports Split Deep and U.S. Postal Censors Like Soviet's

Castro Put Out An Olive Branch to U.S. Before Leaving for Moscow

On the eve of his trip to the Soviet Union—so we are informed by a trustworthy source—Fidel Castro went to the Swiss Embassy in Havana, which represents U.S. interests there, and proposed that he visit Switzerland on his return from Moscow for a discussion of how Cuban-American relations might be improved. . . . The Swiss were ready to act as hosts but the State Department turned thumbs down. . . . If the Kennedy Administration weren't so afraid of risking some leadership on this, as on other questions, such informal discussions could have been used (1) to explore the problem of compensation for expropriated U.S. property owners and (2) Cuba's formal offer before the missile crisis last Fall to consider demilitarization if given firm international assurances against aggression. . . . This hitherto unpublished story gives added interest to the fact (see box below) that Castro in his main speech at Moscow May 23 spoke of his desire for normal relattions with the U.S. . . .

A Victory for Khrushchev

Castro's original itinerary was to have included Peking, Algeria and Sweden as well as Moscow. . . . We are told he wanted to visit Sweden for purposes of trade and to demonstrate his desire for close ties with the non-aligned world. . . . But the Swedish trip was dropped after the Swiss visit fell through. The Russians talked him out of a trip to Peking, and the visit to Ben Bella, whom Castro admires more than almost any other leader in the world today, was then also dropped in order to have a face-saving excuse for not visiting China. . . . In the giant contest between Peking and Moscow for leadership of the Communist world, Castro's signature on the joint communique in Moscow upholding peaceful coexistence is regarded as bigger victory for Khrushchev than the adhesion of the Indonesian Communist Party to Peking's side. . . . Castro today is a symbol to the youth of the Soviet bloc of revolutionary purity; the Chinese made criticism of Khrushchev's conduct in the Cuban missile crisis a main point of attack; to have Castro turn up on Khrushchev's side is a defeat for Mao. . . .

Slight Crack in the Iceberg?

West Coast business interests anxious for revival of trade with China have encouraged the formation of a Committee for the Review of Our China Policy, with former Congressman Charles O. Porter of Oregon as co-chairman. The Committee feels slightly encouraged because of a letter from McGeorge Bundy. Porter asked permission to send a plane-load of business men to the Canton Trade Fair next Fall, or alternatively, to meet with Chinese representatives in Hongkong. His letter was sent to the President March 26. The reply, from Bundy, was dated May 17. It said a reply had been delayed pending a review of policy "which is still under way." In the meantime public discussion of foreign policy, "and particularly our policy toward the Peiping regime," Bundy wrote, "is most desirable." This might portend a slight crack in the iceberg of our China policy. We wait to see the outcome of that policy review.

The May 15 issue of Anna Louise Strong's newsletter from China (her address is 9 Tai Chi Chang, Peking), reports that the split between Peking and Moscow is as fundamental as that between the 2d and 3rd Internationals, and later between Stalin and Trotzky. She terms it the third of Maxism's Three Great Debates. . . . In a private letter to us she complains that while the Chinese are publishing what the other side is saying in this debate, the U.S. postoffice—like the Russian—is returning undelivered pamphlets sent here explaining the Chinese side. . . .

The monolithic Communist world of Stalin's day is disappearing. . . . Thorez in a closing address to a 3-day meeting of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party (*Le Monde*, May 15) said the idea of a one-party State was "a Stalinist error." . . . While supporting Khrushchev on peaceful co-existence he upheld creative freedom for writers and artists. . . . So did the Italian Communist leader, Togliatti, in his interview with K. S. Karol (*New Statesman*, May 24), where he defended Nekrassov, Vozniessenski and Yevtushenko. . . . It's only in the Kremlin that Stalinist stuffiness hangs on . . . .

What Castro Said in Moscow About His Desire for Peace With the United States

"The U.S. maintains a rigid economic blockade of our country and applies pressure on all countries under its influence to hinder trade with Cuba. Thousands of counter-revolutionary elements are receiving military and subversive training on U.S. territory. Counter-revolutionary agents and arms are being contiually smuggled into Cuban territory. Yankee warships and aircraft systematically violate our sea and air space. Recently, a pirate plane from an American base bombed one of our oil refineries. Finally, the U.S. continues to occupy a portion of our territory on which it has a military base where murderers of Cuban workers have gone unpunished and from which saboteurs infiltrate our country and all sorts of provocations are staged.

"In the face of this policy of aggression, Cuba has declared its wish to live in peace and maintain normal relations with all countries of the continent, including the United States. An example is Cuba's relations with Canada and Mexico, Brazil and other Latin American countries. The U.S. people themselves have suffered from their government's economic aggression against Cuba. They have been deprived of such products as our tobacco, unequalled in quality by any other available on the world market, and sugar for which U.S. consumers will this year pay close to one billion dollars more as a result of the very high prices the U.S. government's scheming against Cuban sugar has caused on the world market.

"The U.S. people are themselves victims of this unreasonable policy. U.S. policy against the Cuban revolution is completely bankrupt and the U.S. government has suffered a major political defeat as a consequence. Hatred for the Cuban revolution is being fanned by unscrupulous politicians who are blackmailing the present administration, pushing it to the brink of war.

"Our people, like all people of the socialist camp, want peace to forge ahead and build a better life. (Applause)."

—From Premier Castro's speech in Moscow May 23. Our press ignored it except for a brief item in the New York Times May 24 which came, significantly enough, from Reuters, the British news service not AP or UPI.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Angry Letters from Constituents Behind Dodd's Partial Switch on Testing

The U.S. Not Solely Dependent on the Seismograph to Police A Ban

(Continued from Page One)

The truth is that a nuclear test ban agreement can be adequately monitored without inspection. The truth appears when one juxtaposes two questions. The first is—can one be sure of detecting every underground test? The answer is no. Obviously if a test is made small enough and buried deeply enough, it might escape detection. The other question is—could a cheating power be sure of escaping detection? The answer is no. The earth's crust is so anomalous, the eccentricities so strange, that no cheating power could be sure of escaping detection. Only recently, for example, a North Canadian station with ordinary seismic equipment detected a five ton shot (five *tons,* not kilotons) more than 2500 miles away in Oklahoma. Then also, as we know but won't explain publicly, the preparation of underground testing is a complex affair, calling for a large mobilization of men and materials. It would be unlikely to escape detection by our electronic and other intelligence in the Soviet Union. *We are not just dependent on the seismograph.*

Inspection Is Not Disarmament

Somebody has got to begin to educate the American public to these facts before we have another round of testing. Ever since Dulles, the U.S. public has been conditioned to think of inspection as somehow a form of disarmament; it is indeed the only form acceptable to the Pentagon and the CIA. We are asking the Russians to take the risk of remaining permanently behind in certain forms of military nuclear technology by agreeing to a test ban. That risk for them is far more real than the bugaboo of cheating.

A breakdown into a new round of testing would be a catastrophe. The Russians may resume atmospheric testing in the Fall. Their military are as ready to discount the dangers of fallout as ours; their logic is the same as the Pentagon's. Against the backdrop of so dire a possibility, the Dodd-Humphrey resolution for a test ban on atmospheric tests only seems a parochial maneuver in the little egocentric hothouse of the U.S. Senate. A flood of protesting letters—800 is the figure around the Capitol—has forced Dodd to make this gesture, and Humphrey has joined in though he knows the Russians have rejected this offer before and will again. They claim it puts them at a disadvantage, that we have the know-how and the resources for underground testing. Humphrey joined Dodd because the latter can no longer picture the agitation for a test ban as a Communist plot when he himself—though only in this limited form—recognizes its logic. But the Republicans who blocked our adherence to the League of Nations after World War I also recognized the logic of a League, and killed the treaty by "reservations" not by frontal attack. The Dodd resolution gives him, as it does such other sponsoring Senators as Keating and Scott, Dominick and Lausche, an out with pro-test ban constituents. But it must seem to the Russians only another bit of evidence that we're not really serious either about a test ban or disarmament.

The Poison and The Peril Rise

"Measurements of strontium-90 in food supplies and the total diet in the U.S. show that the levels rose from a value of 4-8 strontium units (SU) in 1961 to 8-13 SU in 1962, and may rise to a peak value of 50 SU in 1963."

—Federal Radiation Council Report, June 1.

"The accelerating pace of weapons testing over the past decade is self-evident from this table. The 40 megatons of fission yield detonated in the inclusive years 1957-8 is only slightly less than the sum total of all tests conducted up to the beginning of 1957. Similarly, the 101 megatons detonated in the inclusive years of 1961-62 is slightly larger than the total of all testing conducted through 1958. These yields, when compared to the 10 megatons per year* reference condition developed by the Joint Committee in 1957, suggests that unusually high levels of stratospheric fallout could be anticipated in 1963 and 1964."

—Introductory statement as the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy opened radiation hearings June 3.

*A panel of experts in 1957 figured that 10 megaton a year was a safe upper limit for testing.

Of All Those Who Mourn Pope John, How Few Will Take to Heart His Message?

I.F. Stone's Bi-Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

6/10/63

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I.F. Stone's Bi-Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every other Monday at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent bi-weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED